IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

HENNA CARDENAS, Individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	Case No.: 9:20-cv-376-RMG
Plaintiff,) RULE 26(f) REPORT
vs.	
RESORT SALES BY SPINNAKER, INC. and RESORT SALES MISSOURI, INC.	
Defendants.	
The parties, having consulted pursuan follows (check one below):	t to Rule 26(f), Fed. R. Civ. P., hereby report as
	orth in the Conference and Scheduling Order issued this case. The information required by Local Civil led by the parties.
July 29, 2020 requires modific Amended Scheduling Order (us	forth in the Conference and Scheduling Order issued ation as set forth in the attached proposed Consent see same format as the Court's standard scheduling formation required by Local Civil Rule 26.03 will es.
we request a scheduling condiscovery plan as required by 2	on, to agree on a schedule for this case. Therefore, ference with the Court. The parties' proposed 6(f) Fed. R. Civ. P., with disagreements noted, and cal Civil Rule 26.03 will be separately filed by the
Attorneys for Plaintiff	Attorneys for Defendants
/s/ Margaret A. Collins Margaret A. Collins P.S.L.G., LLC d/b/a Palmetto State Law Group, LLC	/s/ S. Harrison Williams Barry L. Johnson (Fed. I.D. No. 2185) S. Harrison Williams (Fed. I.D. No. 12405) Johnson & Davis, PA
2241 Bush River Road Columbia, SC 29210 Tel: (803) 708-7442 meg@pslawsc.com	The Victoria Building, Suite 200 10 Pinckney Colony Road Bluffton, SC 29909 Tel: (843) 815-7121
-and-	barry@jd-pa.com harrison@jd-pa.com

Steven Woodrow (pro hac vice)
Patrick Peluso (pro hac vice)
Woodrow & Peluso, LLC
3900 E. Mexico Avenue, Suite 300
Denver, CO 80210
Tel: (720) 213-0675
swoodrow@woodrowpeluso.com
ppeluso@woodrowpeluso.com

Stefan Coleman
Law Offices of Stefan Coleman, P.A.
201 South Biscayne Blvd., 28th Floor
Miami, Florida 33131
Tel: (877) 333-9427
law@stephancoleman.com

-and-

Robert A. Assuncao (pro hac vice) Steven F. Gooby (pro hac vice) Ansa Assuncao, LLP 100 Matawan Road, Suite 410 Matawan, NJ 07747 Tel: (732) 993-9850 robert.assuncao@ansalaw.com steven.gooby@ansalaw.com

MEDIATION OF CASES PENDING BEFORE JUDGE GERGEL

Instructions: Complete this form and file with the joint Rule 26(f) Report.

Case Name: <u>Henna Cardenas v. Resort Sales by Spinnaker, Inc., et al.</u>

C/A No.: 9:20-cv-376-RMG

1. Would early mediation be useful in this case? If the answer is in the affirmative, when would you propose to conduct mediation in this matter?

RESPONSE:

<u>Plaintiff's position</u>: Plaintiff needs to know the identit(ies) of the entit(ies) who called her on behalf of Defendants together with: (a) the way that/those entit(ies) claim they obtained prior express consent to call Plaintiff, and (b) the total number of people called who supposedly consented in the same way. Defendants control how quickly that information is provided. Instead, they have proposed a bifurcated discovery schedule—where the Parties would first focus solely on the Plaintiff's individual claim—that accomplishes little more than needlessly delaying the litigation *and* the disclosure of information needed to appropriately evaluate settlement consistent with Plaintiff and her counsel's duties to members of the as-yet uncertified class.

<u>Defendants' position</u>: Yes. At the conclusion of Plaintiff (only) merits discovery, if bifurcated discovery is ordered by this Court. In response and contrary to Plaintiff's position, above, Defendants further state that they do not "control how quickly [] information is provided" by non-party independent contractors. Defendants' proposed Phase I topics of discovery, items 1-6, set forth in Defendants' Discovery Plan provide for discovery of non-party independent contractors who may have made the alleged calls to Plaintiff. However, discovery in Phase I should be limited to the merits of Plaintiff's direct liability claims against Defendants since prior discovery and a judicial decision in the District of New Jersey confirmed that neither Defendant made the alleged calls to Plaintiff. If Plaintiff's direct liability claims are dismissed following Phase I, the scope of this case will be narrowed and the burden of unnecessary, time-consuming, and costly discovery will be avoided.

2. If early mediation is not thought to be useful, when is the earliest stage in which you believe it might be useful?

RESPONSE:

<u>Plaintiff's position</u>: See above for Plaintiff. Once the necessary information is disclosed Plaintiff will be in a position to provide a written settlement demand.

Defendant's position: Not applicable.

3. Please provide the court with any additional information that would assist in setting a timeline for required mediation.

RESPONSE: None.

9:20-cv-00376-RMG Date Filed 09/16/20 Entry Number 30 Page 4 of 4

Signatures Party Represented

/s/ Margaret A. Collins, Esq. Plaintiff Henna Cardenas

/s/ S. Harrison Williams, Esq. Defendants Resort Sales by Spinnaker, Inc.

and Resort Sales Missouri, Inc.